

# THE CONDITIONING OF STRESS POSITION IN *WAW* CONSECUTIVE PERFECT FORMS IN BIBLICAL HEBREW

by

E. J. REVELL

*University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5S 1A1*

## INTRODUCTION

1. This paper attempts to add some further details to our understanding of the position of the word stress in *waw* consecutive perfect forms in biblical Hebrew, which remains incomplete in several areas.<sup>1</sup> Distinctive stress position occurs only in first person singular (1cs) and second person masculine singular (2ms) forms. That it does not occur in first person plural forms is perhaps due to the influence of the penultimate stressing typical of that pronoun elsewhere and/or the fact that stress was less likely to shift to *u* than to other vowels in final position.<sup>2</sup> In other perfect forms ending in vowels (3fs, 3pl) stress is final in contextual position, penultimate in pause in most forms, whether used with *waw* consecutive or no. Forms from hollow or geminate roots, or the *hip<sup>c</sup>il* stem, where this is not so, show a tendency to final stress which is also not connected with the *waw* consecutive function.<sup>3</sup> Consequently the following discussion is restricted to 1cs and 2ms forms.

1. The paper derives from a study of different forms of variation in stress and vowel patterns in MT, which has also produced the papers referred to in notes 3 and 12. The opportunity to carry out this work was provided by a fellowship in the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, in 1983-4. I am most grateful to the directorate and staff of the Institute both for this opportunity, and for the excellent facilities and assistance provided.

2. As suggested in Blau (1971, p. 22). An example is the fact that final stress occurs in singular imperative *qal* forms from hollow roots, ending with *qāmeš* or *hireq*, as *šûbî* (Ps 116:7) *šûbā* (Ps 126:4), but not in mpl forms ending with *shureq*.

3. The part played by the *waw* consecutive in inducing final stress in perfect forms (as suggested e.g. in Bergsträsser, 1929, #4e, see also #28e) is limited. 21 of 29 3fs and 3mpl *qal* perfect forms from hollow roots showing final stress at the beginning of a clause have *waw* consecutive (72%), but only 41% of *waw* consecutive forms in this position have final stress (21 of 51). (The study on which this statement is based is being prepared for publication.) The question of why stress position in 1cs and 2ms forms shifted only where

2. L. McFall, in his recent innovative study of these forms (1982), also concluded that the stress position of third person plural forms was not dependent on the *waw* consecutive, and in fact reached conclusions on the significance of syntax and semantics for the stress position of 1cs and 2ms forms similar to those presented below. However, his views differ from those given here in two important respects. One of these is his reliance on the accent system as a key to syntactic/semantic structure. The view taken here has been given elsewhere: vowel pattern and stress position were (for the most part) fixed in a form of reading tradition somewhat different from that reflected by the received accentuation.<sup>4</sup> The differences between the two are not great, so the accentuation can be accepted as corroborative evidence. It cannot, however, be taken as representing primary fact.

3. McFall's contention (1982, p. 193) that stress position in 1cs and 2ms perfect forms with *prefixed waw* is not determined by "consecutive" or other usage, but by the "narrative" or "direct" speech style of the context is also rejected here. Unfortunately, he does not present his views in detail. However, it would seem necessary either to agree that first and second person verb forms inevitably occur in direct speech situations (in which case it must be demonstrated for each occurrence that penultimate stress is due to syntactic/semantic conditioning, not to the fact that the form has the value of *qtl*), or that cases like the speech of David in 1 Sam 17:35 (and the whole of the "Words of Qohelet") are to be classed as narrative in style because they refer to the past (in which case McFall is merely stating the common conclusion in different terms). The decisive fact is the lack of significant evidence for forms with final stress used with the value of *qtl*. The few forms listed by McFall under (3) on p. 194 do not show this. Most of them clearly have the value of *yqtl*, representing either durative or repeated action, or future action.<sup>5</sup> The only ques-

---

the function of the form was "consecutive" cannot be advanced here beyond a repetition of the suggestion (Revell, 1984, p. 440, #8) that this provided a desirable marker identifying the semantic categories.

4. See Revell (1980, p. 165; 1983, p. 37-39). For McFall's view, see McFall (1982, p. 201). His contrasting examples on p. 202 provide an illustration of the fact that the accent system as traditionally understood does not provide the information expected from it. In Deut 14:26 *šām* "there" concludes a "sense unit" (cf. p. 201) and is marked with *revia*. In Exod 40:3 *šām* does not conclude a sense unit, but is marked with the superior disjunctive *zaqef*. What McFall describes here subjectively, in terms of "the speaker's interest" can be described objectively in terms of features of clause structure. See #15.4.a, e.

5. Thus durative or repeated action in the past is presented by *ûbāhantā* (Jer 12:3, cf. *tirʿēnī*); *weʿāmarî* (Jer 20:9, cf. *ʿādabbēr*); *ûbāqaʿtā*, *wehaʿamadā* (Ezek 29:7, cf. *tērōš*, *tiššābēr*); *wehimqarî* (Amos 4:7, cf. *ʿamîr*, *timmāqēr*); also *wahāqimōlî* (Jer 6:17); while

tionable case is *wehēbēlā* (Gen 26:10), but even here the verb can be regarded as referring to the (potential) future relative to *šākab*.<sup>6</sup> Consequently the common view of the significance of stress position as marking the usage either as "simple" (with the value of *qtl*, penultimate stress), or "consecutive" (with the value of *yqtl* or the imperative, final stress) is maintained here.

4. Forms of the 1cs or 2ms perfect with prefixed *waw* are used with the value of *qtl* (*waw* "simple") in a rather restricted set of circumstances:

4.1 As the second of a pair or longer series of perfect forms acting as a semantic unit, that is, representing different aspects of the same event, not different actions in a sequence of events, as *bānīm giddālī werômāmtī* ("Children have I reared and raised", Isa 1:2).

4.2 Where verbs semantically related in the same way occur in a series of short parallel clauses, as *hōbāšitī ēš lāḥ wehīprāḥitī ēš yābēš* ("I have dried up the fresh tree, and caused the dried tree to sprout", Ezek 17:24). Such verbs sometimes refer to actions which could be regarded as sequential, but even in cases like *wehikkīṭw wehiššālī mippīw* ("I struck [the predator] and saved [the sheep] from its mouth", 1 Sam 17:35) the verbs can also be regarded as describing the same event ("by striking . . . I saved"), rather than as separate acts in sequence ("I struck . . . then I saved"). Cases where the two clauses form two stichs of a verse of poetry are probably also to be classed here, as *šaq tāpartī . . . we ʿōlālī be ʿāpār . . .* ("I sewed on sackcloth, and laid in the dust . . .", Job 16:15).<sup>7</sup>

4.3 In Qohelet, all 1cs and 2ms perfect forms with prefixed *waw* have the value of *qtl*, and this also appears to be true of *we ʾākālī*

---

future action is presented by *wehēbēlī* (Lev 26:41, cf. ʾēlēk); *wedāraštā* (Deut 17:4, cf. *yim-māšē*<sup>3</sup> 17:2); and *wehišʾarī* (1 Kgs 19:18, cf. *yāmū* 19:17), as translated by the LXX and Jerome. Where Hebrew words are presented merely as morphological illustration, or, as here, to direct the reader's attention to grammatical features on which a translation must be based, a translation seems unnecessary (as the text is readily available). The stress position referred to in this paper is that of the Leningrad Codex. It is indicated here only where it is significant for the argument.

6. On this see Driver (1892, p. 133). *we ʾāmārtī* (Job 7:4; Driver, 1892, #138.i.a) is possibly a similar case, but with penultimate stress due to the fact that it introduces speech (see #14.3).

7. In a number of cases the second verb could refer to past or future, as *dibbartī we ʾāšitī* (Ezek 17:24 etc.). The following cases seem certain. Under #4.1, 1 Sam 12:2, 2 Kgs 19:22, Isa 1:2, 43:12; Ps 28:7, 38:9, 131:2; Cant 2:3, Lam 2:22, Dan 8:27, Ezra 9:6, 2 Chr 7:16. Under #4.2, 1 Sam 17:35, 1 Kgs 3:11, Isa 43:14, Ezek 17:24, Ps 50:21, Dan 10:15, Ezra 9:13, Neh 9:7, 1 Chr 17:10, 2 Chr 7:12, and, in parallel stichs, Prov 9:12, Job 16:15, and (less certainly) Job 7:4. (In Driver, 1892, #104, *wehehērāšitī* in Ps 50:21 is listed as a minor pausal form, but it was probably understood as referring to the past. See the LXX and Jerome.)

(Lev 10:19), *wehiggádî* (1 Sam 3:13), *wehehēzāqî* (1 Sam 17:35), *wedib-bártî* (Hos 12:11), *wenibbētî* (Ezek 37:7), *wehinnabbētî* (Ezek 37:10), *wehiṣṣāltā* (Ps 86:13), *wahākînôî* (1 Chr 28:2), and *weyādā<sup>c</sup>tî* (1 Chr 29:17). The usage of Qohelet would seem to reflect a stage of the language in which the *waw* consecutive perfect was not in use (as in Mishnaic Hebrew). The other cases could represent intrusions from such a stage into earlier forms of language, although other explanations are possible.<sup>8</sup> The cases in #4.1, and at least most of those in #4.2, appear to represent a usage standard throughout the biblical period. Where verbs represented the same past event, or past events which were related but not sequential, the second was perfect in form, whether *waw* was prefixed or no. The negative assessment of rule (1) in Driver (1892, p. 159) expressed in Heusman (1956, p. 434) does not seem to be justified.

#### SEMANTIC RELATIONSHIP AND PHONOLOGICAL VARIATION

5. In 1cs and 2ms perfect forms with *waw* consecutive,<sup>9</sup> stress may be final or penultimate. There is no doubt that McFall is correct in identifying semantic relationship as a major cause of this variation. Conditioning by semantic relationship was not, of course, direct; it was effected, when the text was read, by the intonation patterns (suprasegmental contours) which reflected such relationship. By this means, semantic relationship became a main cause of phonological variation in a wide range of forms in Hebrew. Such relationship can often be described in terms of syntax, but where this is not the case, precise objective description is often not possible.<sup>10</sup> Consequently it is often not possible to provide a precise, objective description of the conditioning of the variations in question. This fact is a necessary background to the consideration of the following introductory description of conditioning by semantic relationship, and of the subsequent description of the effect of such conditioning on perfect forms with *waw* consecutive.

6. Familiar examples of variation in vowel pattern and stress position conditioned by the relationship of words to their context are seen in

8. E.g. the use of *waw* simple with the perfect in a past untrue condition (as in Lev 10:19) may have been standard, though rare (cf. Driver, 1892, #155). In fact, however, it is shown in Mayer (1959) and supported by Loretz (1961) that there is no need to regard cases of *waw* simple with the perfect in early material as late intrusions.

9. "Perfect with *waw* consecutive" below refers only to 1cs and 2ms forms.

10. The same is true for the accentuation, which may reflect interpretation contrary to what is, or might be, suggested by the surface structure. See Yeivin (1980, #289), especially under Exod 33:19, 34:5; Deut 26:5; Judg 5:18, 6:24; 2 Kgs 19:13; Isa 1:13, 40:3, 56:9; Ezek 44:22.

those nouns which appear in different forms called construct and absolute, and those verbs which appear in different forms called contextual and pausal. The features in which such forms differ from each other do not, either in nouns or in verbs, directly reflect original morphological differences. They arise from the effect of intonation patterns reflecting the relationship of the word to its context.

7. In the case of the construct noun, the syntactic relationship to what followed was reflected by the close joining in speech of the construct noun to the following word, resulting in the differences in the development of originally short vowels (reduction or failure to develop) which distinguishes construct forms from absolute.<sup>11</sup> The use of this "construct" or "close joined" form is not restricted to a particular syntactic relationship, but may occur before attributive or other modifiers, as *meqôm* "place" in Gen 39:20, *ʔahad* "one" in 1 Sam 9:3, *ʕên* "eye" in 1 Sam 11:2. In originally doubly closed monosyllables, the development of short vowels was generally slower than in the originally open final syllables of most nouns, so that, in such monosyllables, the form with more developed vowels is used in a more restricted range of positions than is the typical "absolute" noun, and the form with less developed vowels is used much more widely than the typical "construct". Consequently the first form in such pairs as *perî/perî* "fruit", *ʕam/ʕām* "people", and *šēkel/šēkel*<sup>12</sup> "understanding" is not called "construct". Nevertheless this form (and not the other) is regularly used in "construct" situations, and the reasons for the difference in vowel pattern are exactly the same as in typical construct/absolute forms. Close-joining in speech (reflecting close syntactic/semantic relationship) causes the reduction of vowels, or inhibits their development. (Relative) separation from what follows permits the retention and facilitates the development of such vowels.

8. Differences between contextual and pausal forms originated in the same way (these terms are applied to *perî/perî*). The pausal form, used at a significant division in the text, is separated from what follows. Consequently originally short vowels in such forms are retained and develop. In contextual forms such vowels are reduced and/or show less development, because these forms were joined in speech with the following word. Where the pausal form shows penultimate stress, and the contextual form final, the final stress results from the effect of close

11. The retention of *taw* in the feminine gender marker, as *šēnat* "year (of)", results from the same close-joining. The consonant acts as (phrase) medial rather than (word) final.

12. On the development of the vowel in this form see my study of "The Vowelling of the 'i' type Segolates in Tiberian Hebrew" forthcoming in the *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*.

relationship to the following word, both in the noun *péri* and in many verb forms. Separation from what follows does not affect stress position. As with construct and absolute forms, the use of contextual and pausal forms cannot be rigidly defined in terms of syntax. The usual definition is based on the accent system, which reflects both syntactic and other semantic relationships, and also musical phenomena. This distinguishes "standard" pausal positions (with *sillûq*, and *atnāh*, or, in the Three Books, *oleh weyôrēd*) in which pausal forms are regularly used, and "minor" positions (with other accents) in which the use of these forms is only sporadic.<sup>13</sup> Evidently, then, a division significant enough to induce a pausal form was regularly made in the form of the reading tradition reflected by the vowelling and stress position of MT where the received accentuation shows standard pausal position, and such a division was quite often (about 20%) made in other positions as well.

9.1 Pausal forms in "minor" positions usually occur at the ends of clauses, but only of those which are not closely related to what follows. It is not possible to describe such relationship both comprehensively and objectively, but one guide, generally valid, is that a clause will not end in a pausal form if it is one (other than the last) in a series of clauses presenting a sequence of actions by the same subject. This is the case with the first two clauses in Deut 4:19, both of which end in forms marked as contextual. In the speech quoted in Isa 65:13, however, each of the six short clauses has a different subject from the preceding, and each ends in a pausal form (where this distinction can be shown). These clauses are arranged in contrasting pairs. No doubt this semantic relationship also contributed, in this case, to the separation of the clauses which gave rise to the pausal forms. (See also n. 18.)

9.2 Pausal forms in "minor" position may also occur at significant divisions within clauses, as *he<sup>c</sup>miqû šihētû kîmê haggib<sup>c</sup>ā* (Hos 9:9) and *kēn-hānû lediglêhem wekēn nāsā<sup>c</sup>û ʾiš lemišpehōtāw . . .* (Num 2:34). Such pausal forms stand at the end of semantic units, as do others. In these cases the two verbs form a semantic unit modified by the words following the second verb, so that the second verb is more closely related to what precedes it than to what follows it. This relationship was reflected, when the text was read, by a division after the second verb, so

13. An attempt is made to describe the uses of a selected group of cases in terms of the accent system in Ben David (1984). Considerable consistency between the use of pausal forms and accentuation is found, as is to be expected, since both reflect a syntactic/semantic analysis of the same text. For this paper it is significant that the consistency is not demonstrated in the use of pausal forms with particular accents, but in their use within the major (semantic) units ending with *atnāh* or *sillûq*.

that the intonation patterns gave rise to a pausal form, just as at the end of a clause not closely related to what follows.

10. In some cases divisions within clauses appear to have been made on rhythmic grounds. The text was evidently read, as a rule, in rather short units. Pausal forms may occur at the end of such units even where this does not coincide with the end of a clause. The most striking case of this sort is the list, which is divided into units consisting of several short items (as in Lev 14:54–56, Deut 5:14), or of one longer item (as in Lev 5:23, Zech 12:12–14). Each such unit may end in a pausal form, as is the case in the examples noted. Other cases in which conventional linguistic rhythm gave rise to a division marked by a pausal form may be ascribed to the general tendency to divide units such as clauses into (at least) two parts. This tendency is most noticeable in the use of the lesser pausal phenomena described below (#11). In some cases, however, pausal forms occurring at the main division of an accentual unit ending with *atnāḥ* or *sillūq* reflect this tendency. The verb of a main clause most commonly appears in pausal form for this reason:

(i) where the verb is clause-initial and the clause is very short, as *wenišqāpā* (Num 21:20), *tidbāqīn* (Ruth 2:8).

(ii) where the verb is clause-initial and is closely related to what precedes, as in Num 2:34, Hos 9:9 quoted in #9.2.

(iii) where the verb is preceded by a constituent of the clause, as *šāmārū* (Num 9:23), *rāʾātā* (Isa 64:3, at the main syntactic division, not the main division marked by the accents).<sup>14</sup>

11.1 The influence of semantic relationship on vowel pattern and stress position is reflected in other phenomena besides pausal forms. Conjunctive *waw* is typically pointed with *qameṣ* before the last of two or more words acting as a semantic unit, where the word is stressed on its first syllable. This reflects the fact that such word groups were characteristically treated as speech units of a lesser sort (“phrases” rather than “clauses”). For this reason the monosyllabic nouns mentioned in #7 appear in “joined” form where they are the first of such a pair, in “separated” form where they are second, as *bekî wānéhî* (Jer 9:9), *ʿam wāʿam* (Esth 1:22), and cf. *nēbel wetōp* (1 Sam 10:5, “lute and timbrel”; *nēbel* with *šere* begins a list of four nouns treated as a single phrase) with *kinnôr wānébel* (Isa 5:12, “lyre and lute”; *nēbel* with *segol* ends the first phrase in a list of five nouns treated as two phrases). This phenomenon is merely a specialized case of a word closely related to what

14. The verb of a subordinate clause which ends a constituent of a main clause may appear in pausal form, as may other words in such positions, as *ʿāsātā* (Esth 2:1), cf. *lāk* (1 Kgs 8:50).

precedes (see #9.2), and, as shown in Hos 9:9 (quoted there), a phrase of this sort may end in a pausal form in a "minor" pausal situation.<sup>15</sup>

11.2 Stress may be retracted in a word of particular phonological structure which is closely joined (with a conjunctive accent) to a following word which is stressed on its first syllable.<sup>16</sup> Such retraction (*nesîgā*, *nāsôg āhôr*) is common only in construct nouns and in verbs (and not, for instance, in participles). This presumably reflects the tendency, noted above, for nouns in construct, and verbs in contextual position, to be closely joined in speech to what follows. *Nesîgā* occurs regularly at the ends of clauses, and of introductions to quoted speech. Elsewhere within clauses it occurs much less frequently. Consequently it can be assumed that *nesîgā* is induced at syntactic/semantic divisions, and that its occurrence within a clause reflects a "phrase level" division of this sort.<sup>17</sup>

12. The phenomena described above, then, reflect the fact that the words they mark stood within, or at the end of, units of speech. They result from the effect, on the vowel-ing and stressing of those words, of the intonation patterns characteristic of those units. The units are those into which the text was divided when read according to a particular form of the reading tradition. Such divisions reflect the syntactic/semantic structure of the text as understood in that form of the tradition. This division, and the understanding on which it is based, differed somewhat from that reflected by the standard accentuation (see #2).<sup>18</sup>

15. Also *mahārā welēkā* (1 Sam 23:27), but the use of *shewa*, not *qāmēš* on the conjunction here is an unexplained anomaly.

16. This description is based on the study outlined in Revell (1983).

17. Rhythmic factors are also involved in the development of *nesîgā*; see Revell (1983, p. 41). So also in the only case in which *nesîgā* occurs in a word not directly related grammatically to the following, *kî ʿim yihye lebāʿer qāyin* ("Qayin will be for burning", Num 24:22), where it presumably results from a division of the unit into more or less equal parts (as the accentuation, for reasons of rhythm) rather than into one long and one short part (as the syntax).

18. Studies like that in Ben David (1984) may show that the differences are, in fact, small. However, in his "control" list of words which could appear in pausal form with *segolta* or first *zaqef* in verses with *atnaḥ* in the first chapter of each of the Twenty-One Books (p. 57–59), of the 95 which occur in contextual form, 61 stand within clauses, the rest at the end of a clause followed by a clause presenting a sequential act by the same subject (12 cases), or a parallel clause with the same subject (8 cases, including Lam 1:12), or a clause otherwise closely related semantically (Exod 1:21, Deut 1:42, Josh 1:8, Judg 1:6, 1 Kgs 1:15, Isa 1:2 (ʿereš), 3, 5, 20, Ezek 1:1, 4, Ruth 1:19, 21, Lam 1:16). In many of these cases one of the clauses is subordinate to the other. *werômāmī* in Isa 1:2 cannot be considered as a marked contextual form, as the general rule is that *qāmēš* develops from original short *i* in pause in the Twenty-One Books only before ʿayin. Of the 20 forms which occur in pausal form, eight stand at the end of a clause followed by one with a different subject, nine before one with the same subject (Deut 1:17, Josh 1:5, 9, Judg 1:15,



13. The units of speech so marked form a hierarchical structure, smaller units combining to form larger ones. Phenomena which mark the ends of smaller units, such as *qāmēš* on conjunctive *waw* or *nesīgā*, occur whether these small units stand within larger units or at the end of them, but some phenomena are restricted to the ends of larger units. Thus *qāmēš* on conjunctive *waw* may occur within a clause, with a contextual form, as <sup>ʿ</sup>*ēš wāʿeben* (“wood and stone”, Deut 29:16), or at clause end, with a pausal form as <sup>ʿ</sup>*ēš wāʿāben* (Deut 28:36). Similarly *nesīgā* regularly occurs at the end of an introduction to speech, as *wayyōmerû lô* “they said to him”, but the full pausal form *yōmērû* does not occur in this position. The level in the hierarchy at which a given phenomenon occurs may be affected by the structure of the word, as already pointed out for nouns originating from doubly closed monosyllables (#7). Similarly, although the “pausal” form *yōmērû* never occurs at the end of an introduction to speech, the pausal form *wayyōmār* may occur in this position, due to its different structure. In a few cases the effect of word structure on phonological change has resulted in a three-term system, as in <sup>ʔ</sup>*attā* “you” (close-joined position results in final stress, #8), also <sup>ʔ</sup>*attā* (“minor pause”; where not close-joined, stress remains penultimate) and <sup>ʔ</sup>*āttā* “standard pause” (maximum separation results in maximum vowel development). So also *šēkel* (within a phrase, Ps 111:10, minimum vowel development, *i* before the syllable was opened, see note 12), *šēkel* (at phrase-end 1 Sam 25:3, greater development, *a* before the syllable was opened), and *šākel* (at clause-end in “standard” pausal position, Job 17:4, maximum vowel development).

#### STRESS POSITION IN PERFECT FORMS WITH WAW CONSECUTIVE

##### *1. Forms with a Closed Penultimate Syllable*

14. Stress position in perfect forms with *waw* consecutive is affected by structural factors, such as those just described, in that final stress is proportionately much more common in forms with a closed penultimate syllable. Penultimate stress occurs in such forms only in the following situations:

---

1 Sam 1:11, Ezek 1:12, 21, Cant 1:4, Ruth 1:13). The two clauses are joined by a conjunction only in Judg 1:15, 1 Sam 1:11, Ezek 1:21, and only in 1 Sam 1:11 could they be held to present acts in sequence. Such pausal forms stand before a subordinate clause in Josh 1:17, before an object clause in 1 Kgs 1:17, and within a list in Ezra 1:9 (see #10). This superficial survey seems to me to confirm beyond any doubt (i) the syntactic/semantic conditioning of pausal forms and (ii) that the accentuation reflects a somewhat different analysis of the text.

14.1 In standard pausal position, as *wešābā<sup>c</sup>tā* Deut 6:11.

14.2 At the end of a clause elsewhere, as *we<sup>ʔ</sup>ākālî* Deut 2:28. Also 1 Sam 20:18, 2 Kgs 9:3, Ezek 3:26, and Isa 66:9 before *ʔamar* marking the clause as quoted speech.

14.3 At the end of an introduction to speech, as *we<sup>ʔ</sup>āmártî* Deut 32:40, also Prov 30:9, and *wenišbā<sup>c</sup>tā* Jer 4:2.

14.4 At the main division of a stich of poetry, as *wešihāttā* Prov 23:8, also Ps 28:1, 143:7, Prov 30:9, Job 31:29.<sup>19</sup>

14.5 At the main division of a verse-half in prose, as *wenikráttā* Obad 1:10. (Cf. (i) at the end of #10.)

14.6 Where the verb is second of a pair forming a semantic unit, as *ʔābô wenilhāmtî* ("[that I should not] come and fight . . .", 1 Sam 29:8), also *wāmáttā* Ezek 28:8.<sup>20</sup>

14.7 Where the verb is followed by a word stressed on its first syllable (see #15).

14.8 These forms exhibit a three-term system of the sort described in #13. Penultimate stress with *qāmēš* occurs regularly in standard pausal position (#14.1). Penultimate stress with *pataḥ* occurs in the other positions listed, but only sporadically. It is assumed (following the description above) that the use of penultimate stress in these other positions reflects the fact that the verb stood at the end of a speech unit; the use of final stress that it stood within one, and so was joined in speech to the following word. The small number of contrasting cases makes it impossible to demonstrate this specifically for situations #14.2–6. However such a demonstration can be attempted for #14.7.

15.1 The development of final stress in a *waw* consecutive perfect form may be blocked where the following word is stressed on its first syllable. As with *nesīgā*, a related phenomenon (#11.2), this only occurs where the words are particularly closely joined, and so only where the verb has a conjunctive accent. A form with a disjunctive accent shows final stress where used within a speech unit (as *wenātattî* Lev 14:34, 1 Sam 17:46) and penultimate stress at the end of a unit (as *we<sup>ʔ</sup>āmártî* Deut 32:40; see #14.3).

19. In Job 31:29, the verb forms a clause. In all these cases the accent is *revia<sup>c</sup> muqrash*. *Nesīgā* quite often occurs in the same situation, as in Ps 104:14, 107:33, Prov 8:27, Job 5:10, suggesting that stichs of poetry were typically read with a (minor) internal division (as other units of speech, see #10).

20. The *qāmēš* on the *waw* reflects a form of tradition in which the pair of words now divided by *atnah* was joined (as in Ps 10:15). Job 42:6 shows a division between a pair of verbs, and modifiers related only to the second of the pair, similar to that reflected by the vowelling in Ezek 28:8.

15.2 Where a verb with a conjunctive accent stands before a word stressed on its first syllable in a clause of two words, stress is FINAL

(a) where the clause is closely related to what follows, in that the two represent sequential actions by the same subject (see #9.1), as *weḥašaqtā bāh welāqahtā* . . . (Deut 21:11, “You desire her and take her as wife”), also Lev 24:5, Deut 23:14, 1 Kgs 8:46 = 2 Chr 6:36, and also in Deut 7:25 before a subordinate clause introduced by *pen*, “lest”.

(b) where the clause ends at *atnāḥ* in *weyāšabtā šām* (1 Kgs 2:36, 17:9, “and live there”). The preceding verb is imperative in both cases. The following clause has the same subject in the first case, but not in the second.

Stress is PENULTIMATE

(c) where the clause is not closely related to what follows, as *wehig-gādī lāk wayyēlek* . . . (Num 23:3, “I will tell you, So he went . . .”), and in other clauses where the following clause has a different subject in 1 Sam 19:3, 1 Kgs 22:13 = 2 Chr 18:12, Ezek 28:22, Hag 1:9.

(d) where the clause ends at *atnāḥ* or *sillūq* in *weyāšabtā bāh* (Deut 17:14, 26:1). The preceding verb is *waw* consecutive perfect in both cases, ultimately dependent on an imperfect verb form. In the first case the clause stands within a series depending on preceding *kī*, “when”, in the second it stands at the end of such a series. Also in *weʾākāltā šām* (Deut 27:7, “and you will eat there”), where the verb also stands within a series of *waw* consecutive perfects dependent on an imperfect, but is semantically imperative.

15.3 Where the clause is composed of three words forming three constituents,<sup>21</sup> stress is FINAL

(a) where the third constituent is the object, as *wenātattā šāmmā māyim* (Exod 30:18, “and you will put there water”) and similarly in Exod 40:7 (at the end of a verse in both cases).

(b) where the clause does not include a (nominal) object, as *weʾāhabitā lō kāmōkā* (Lev 19:34, “you will love him as yourself”).

(c) where the second constituent is the object, in *wešākaḥtā ʿōmer baššāde* (Deut 24:19, “and you forget a sheaf in the field”).

Stress is PENULTIMATE

21. The possible constituents are: nominal (a noun, pronoun, or phrase acting as subject, or as objective or other modifier), prepositional (preposition followed by a nominal or infinitival element), or a particle (adverb). The examples here include no cases of a verb followed by a two-word phrase. Note that the verb stands first in all clauses described in this paper, and that <sup>2</sup>*et* and other monosyllabic prepositions are ignored in the counting of the number of words in the clause.

(d) where the second constituent is the object, as *wešilláhîf déber betôkekem* (Lev 26:25, "I will send a plague among you"); also Jer 17:27, 21:14, 50:32; Ezek 30:14, 16, 32:8; Amos 1:12, 2:5.

15.4 In longer clauses of three constituents (of which the second is a single word), stress is FINAL

(a) where the third constituent is the object, and the clause is short (four or five words) and is not closely related to what follows, as *wenâtattâ lî gullôt mâyim wayyittēn . . .* ("Give me sources of water. So he gave her . . .", Josh 15:19 = Judg 1:15), also Exod 40:3, 1 Sam 16:3, 2 Sam 15:34, Jer 22:1, and also Exod 30:26, where the first two words, plus the first item in a list forming the object, fit this description (on lists see #10).

(b) where the clause does not include an object, as *wenilhamtâ bô<sup>c</sup> kallôtām<sup>o</sup> ôtām* ("and you will battle them until you have destroyed them", 1 Sam 15:18), also Exod 29:5, 43.

Stress is PENULTIMATE

(c) where the second constituent is the object, or the subject, as *wešilláhîf<sup>c</sup> eš . . .* ("I will send fire . . .", Amos 1:4), also Ezek 17:22, 22; Amos 1:7, 10, 14.

(d) where the third constituent is the object, and the clause contains four or five words, but is closely related to what follows, as *weyāšáqtā lô<sup>c</sup> arba<sup>c</sup> tabbe<sup>c</sup> ôt zāhāb wenātattâ . . .* ("You will cast for it four gold rings and put them . . .", Exod 25:12), also Ezek 14:13, despite the *atnāh*. Also where the clause is longer than four or five words, as *we<sup>c</sup>ābādtā* Deut 28:36, 64 (in both cases at the main *syntactic* division of a *sillūq* unit) and *we<sup>o</sup>āmártā* in Ezek 28:12, 35:3, where the object is quoted speech.

(e) where the clause does not include an object, in Deut 14:26, Ezek 28:25, 35:11, 39:27. The only consistent difference between these clauses and those in which the verb has final stress, listed in (b) above, is that in these the word following the verb is a closed monosyllable; in those it is not. Also *wehehēzāqtā bô gēr wetôšāb* ("You will support him [in the same way as] a temporary resident", Lev 25:35) in which the terminal noun phrase might be considered as an object. (The clause is closely related to what follows, cf. (d) above.)

15.5 In a clause of more than three constituents, stress is FINAL

(a) only in *wenišsabtâ lî šām<sup>c</sup> al rōš hāhār* ("You will present yourself to me there, on top of the mountain", Exod 34:2, where the clause does not include an object).

Stress is PENULTIMATE

(b) where the object is the second constituent, as in *wezābāhtā pēsah . . .* (Deut 16:2).

(c) where the object is the third constituent, in Josh 15:16 = Judg 1:12, 2 Sam 9:10, Jer 24:10, Hos 2:17. These cases are discussed in #25.2.

16.1 Where the clause consists of two constituents (two words), stress is FINAL if the clause is closely related to what follows (#15.2a, 6 cases), PENULTIMATE where it is not (#15.2c–d, 9 cases). There are two anomalous cases of final stress (#15.2b). The same factor governs the use, at the end of a clause, of pausal forms (see #9.1), and of *nesîgā* (see Revell, 1984, p. 41), although, since *nesîgā* marks the end of lower level units (see #13), it is relatively more common in this situation than are pausal forms. The occurrence of final stress in the two anomalous cases may possibly be related to the failure of *nesîgā* due to rhythmic factors (Revell, 1984, p. 41) and/or to the cases of anomalous final stress mentioned in n. 32 below.

16.2 Where the clause consists of three or more constituents:

(a) where the second constituent is the object (or the subject)  
stress is FINAL only in Deut 24:19 (#15.3c, cf. #18.6b).

stress is PENULTIMATE in sixteen cases (#15.3d, 4c, 5b).

(b) where the third constituent is the object  
stress is FINAL where the clause is composed of three constituents, and is relatively short, but is not closely related to what follows (9 cases, #15.3a, 4a, if the case in Exod 30:26 is not considered an exception).  
stress is PENULTIMATE where the clause is composed of three constituents, and is relatively short, and closely related to what follows, or is relatively long (6 cases, #15.4d, if the case in Ezek 14:13 is not considered an exception) or if the clause is composed of more than three constituents (5 cases, #15.5c).

(c) where the clause does not contain an object,

stress is FINAL in five cases (#15.3b, 4b, 5a).

stress is PENULTIMATE in five cases (#15.4e).

16.3 It is quite clear from this summary that stress position in a *waw* consecutive perfect form standing before a word stressed on its first syllable is conditioned by semantic factors. These appear as

(i) The relation of the clause to what follows: Where this relationship was close, no (significant) division would be made between clauses.

(ii) The presence and position of the object: this can be interpreted as follows. The verb and its object were normally spoken as a (phrase level) unit. Consequently, where the object is second constituent, it stands at the end of a phrase, so that the intonation patterns prevent the development of final stress in the verb (#16.2a), just as they would cause retraction of stress in situations standard for *nesîgā*. Where the object is third and last constituent, and the clause is not closely related to what follows, the verb and its object were again spoken as a unit, including the

intervening word. That is, the whole clause was spoken as a unit, without an internal division sufficient to prevent the development of final stress in the verb (#16.2b). Where the object is third constituent under other circumstances, the tendency was to make a division after the second constituent sufficient to prevent the development of final stress in the verb (#16.2b). Presumably it was not reasonable to treat the verb and its object as a single speech unit. In a long three constituent clause it was too long; so also in a short three constituent clause closely related to what followed, because no (significant) division would be made after the third constituent (see (i) above). In a clause of more than three constituents the object was either treated with what followed in a similar way, or (if long) formed an independent (phrase level) speech unit. Presumably similar semantic relationships reflected in the intonation patterns governed the stressing of the verb in clauses which did not contain an object constituent, but there is no basis for an objective description (#16.2c).

## II. Forms with an Open Penultimate Syllable

17 Where the penultimate syllable of a perfect form with *waw* consecutive is open, stress is always penultimate in forms from the *qal* stem of roots III<sup>3</sup> (excluding *BW*<sup>3</sup>) and III *h* (See further #19.1). The only exception is *we<sup>3</sup>āpītā* (Lev 24:5).<sup>22</sup>

18 Other forms show penultimate stress in the same “pausal” situations as were listed for forms with closed penultimate syllables in #14. (There is no case parallel to #14.3, where the verb ends an introduction to speech.)

18.1 In standard pausal position, as *wenahbētā* (1 Sam 19:2).

18.2 At the end of a clause elsewhere, as *wehēbētā* (2 Sam 9:10).

18.3 At the main division of a stich of poetry, as *wahāzikkōtī* (Job 9:30), also *wahāqīšōtā* (Prov 6:22).<sup>23</sup>

18.4 At the main division of a verse-half in prose, as *wahāšiqōtī* (Isa 29:2) (cf. (i) at the end of #10).

18.5 Second of a pair of verbs forming a semantic unit, as *tiššā<sup>3</sup> ūbātā* (Deut 12:26—despite the following <sup>3</sup>*el*, see #19.1) and *wešabtā<sup>3</sup> wekissūtā* (Deut 23:14—despite the following <sup>3</sup>*et*, see #19.3).<sup>24</sup>

18.6 Before a word stressed on its first syllable, where the verb has a conjunctive accent (see #15.1).

22. Also *werā<sup>3</sup>ītā* (Deut 21:11) in the Leningrad Codex, but the failure to repeat the *pashā* sign was probably due to lack of space.

23. Both with *revia<sup>c</sup> mugrash*. In Prov 6:22, the verb forms a clause.

24. This is against the accentuation, but cf. note 18. In Deut 23:14, the clause is not closely related to what follows. In the similar case in 1 Sam 15:3, it is.

(a) in a two-word clause, stress is penultimate in *wahāniḥōtī lāk* (Exod 33:14) where the clause is not closely related to what follows (see #16.1).

In a clause of three or more constituents which includes an object,

(b) where the second constituent is the object, stress is FINAL in *wahārēmōtā* (Num 31:28), PENULTIMATE in *wehēbētī* (Lev 26:36), *wehitwītā* (Ezek 9:4), *wezērītī* (Mal 2:3). Forms with a closed penultimate generally show penultimate stress in this situation, see #16.2a. Where final stress is shown, the third constituent is a one-word prepositional element which could have been treated as modifying the one-word object, as “the Lord’s due” (*mekes laYHWH* Num 31:28), or a “sheaf not ingathered” (‘*ōmer baššāde* Deut 24:19, see #16.2a). *Nesīgā* and similar phenomena are unlikely to occur before a two-word phrase of this sort (cf. *wenātati* Lev 14:34).

(c) where the third constituent is the object, stress is FINAL in *ūmillētā* (Exod 28:17), *wahāqīmōtī* (1 Sam 2:35, Ezek 16:60). In Ezek 16:60, the clause is short, and closely related to what follows, so that final stress is expected under #16.2b. In the other two cases the clause is long, but in both, the object, or its first element, ends at the main (accentual) division of an *atnāḥ* unit. Possibly, then, a division at this point equivalent to that at the end of a short clause was caused by the rhythmic factor (see #10, and the note on Exod 30:26 in #15.4a).

(d) where the object is the fourth constituent, stress is FINAL in *wehēbētā* (Exod 26:33).

(e) where no object constituent is present, stress is PENULTIMATE in *ūneqallōtī* (2 Sam 6:22—despite the following ‘*ayin*, see #19) and *wahāniḥōtī* (1 Chr 22:9).

(f) Stressing in these forms, can, then, be seen as following the same pattern as in the forms with a closed penultimate syllable described in #16.1–2. Presumably, then, stress position here too is conditioned by the factors described in #16.3.

19 In other situations, *waw* consecutive perfect forms show final stress where the following word begins with *alep*, *he*, *het*, or ‘*ayin*,<sup>25</sup> with the following exceptions:

19.1 Final stress is shown in *qal* forms from *BW*<sup>3</sup> only before *alef*.<sup>26</sup> It seems likely that this is related to the phenomenon mentioned in #17.

25. The letter in question is usually *alep*, less commonly ‘*ayin* (as Gen 26:10, Jer 6:17, Ezek 16:37 and elsewhere). Final stress occurs before *he* in Ezek 32:5, Amos 8:9, before *het* in Ezek 5:13, 6:12, 16:42, 21:8.

26. So in *ūbātā* in Gen 6:18 and six other cases (as is well known), but not in a minor pausal situation in Deut 12:26 (see #18.5), and not before ‘*ayin* in 1 Sam 10:3. The *lcs* form never occurs before a word beginning with a guttural.

The development of final stress is inhibited in forms which do not have an originally long antepenultimate syllable. The inhibiting factor is nullified in forms from the *hip<sup>c</sup>il* of *BW<sup>3</sup>*, possibly under the influence of other *hip<sup>c</sup>il* forms.<sup>27</sup> The inhibiting factor may also have been nullified by the following *alep* in *we<sup>3</sup>āpîṭā* (Lev 24:5, see #24.1), as it is in the *qal* forms from *BW<sup>3</sup>*. In any case it is probable that the *qal* forms from *BW<sup>3</sup>* sometimes show final stress, while other *qal* forms from roots III<sup>3</sup> and III *h* do not, because the forms from *BW<sup>3</sup>* are composed only of two syllables, and final stress developed more readily in such short forms than in longer forms.<sup>28</sup>

19.2 Final stress is shown in forms from stems other than *qal* of roots III *h* in two-word clauses only before *alef*, as *wehiprêṭî<sup>3</sup>ōtô* (Gen 17:20) and seven other cases.<sup>29</sup> Penultimate stress occurs before *alef* only in *wehîrbûā<sup>3</sup>et gebûlî* (1 Chr 4:10).

19.3 In longer clauses, forms from stems other than *qal* of roots III *h* show final stress before a word beginning with a guttural in forty-nine cases. There are four exceptions, described in #26.2.

20 Where a *waw* consecutive perfect form occurs in a form or situation other than those described in #17–19, stress position varies according to the length and structure of the clause.<sup>30</sup>

27. Blau (1971, p. 18, n. 6) is justifiably wary of this suggestion, but his treatment of all forms in which both penultimate and antepenultimate syllables are open, in a single group is not justified. Forms in which the antepenultimate is open in MT, but was originally long (closed, or with a long vowel) act just as do those forms in which this syllable is closed in MT, showing final stress under particular conditions, as is described here. It is probably correct to assume, as does Gordon (1938, p. 323), that all forms in which the antepenultimate was originally open with a short vowel, originally acted in the same way, but, in MT, forms from the *hip<sup>c</sup>il* of *BW<sup>3</sup>* act as do forms with an originally long antepenultimate, and only *qal* forms act differently. Argument that a feature of one form is due to the influence of related forms ("analogy") is always unsatisfactory, but it is true that all other *hip<sup>c</sup>il* forms either have more syllables than those from *BW<sup>3</sup>* (a significant factor, see Blau, 1971, #5.4) or have an originally long antepenultimate—a fact obscured by Blau's viewpoint.

28. E.g. final stress is not uncommon in perfect and imperative forms with vocalic affix from the *qal* stem of hollow or geminate roots (see above n. 2, 3), that is in forms of two syllables, but is extremely rare in the longer imperfect forms, and in forms from other stems.

29. Exod 40:4, Lev 26:9, 9, 1 Sam 15:3, Ezek 4:6, 36:29, 37:26. Not before *ayin* in 1 Sam 10:6, Ps 38:9 (although in the latter case penultimate stress could be due to a minor pausal situation (see #18.5).

30. It has long been noted that, in *waw* consecutive perfect forms from roots III<sup>3</sup> and III *h*, final stress is more usual where the penultimate vowel is *šere*, penultimate stress where it is *hireq*. E.g. Bergsträsser (1929, #4d). This is presumably not mere coincidence, but the reason for it is uncertain, and it has not proved possible to show that this is a key



20.1 In clauses of two words, stress is FINAL in (a)<sup>31</sup> *wehēṣībōtî* Ezek 36:11, (c) *wehēbētā* Gen 27:10, also *wehōṣētā bō* Ezek 12:5.

20.2 Stress is PENULTIMATE

in (b) *wahāṣērōtî* Jer 10:18, Zeph 1:17, (c) *wenimṣētî* Jer 29:14.

20.3 The cases from (a) hollow and (b) geminate roots are of similar structure due to sound change. Where penultimate stress is shown, the word following the verb is stressed on its second or third syllable. The word following *wehēṣībōtî* (Ezek 36:11) is stressed on its fifth. Probably the unusual length of this word has allowed the development of final stress, as in a longer two-constituent clause (#21). Among the forms from (c) roots III<sup>2</sup>, penultimate stress is shown in Jer 29:14, where the clause is followed by a phrase marking it as quoted speech. In Gen 27:10, the clause is closely related to what follows (its indirect object is subject of the following one-word clause) and this may have led to final stressing (see #16.3.i). In Ezek 12:5, the verb stands in a two-word clause, before a word stressed (with *sillûq*) on its first syllable, so penultimate stress is expected (see #18.6a). Anomalous final stress does occur, however, in a number of similar positions.<sup>32</sup>

21.1 In longer clauses of two constituents, stress is FINAL in forms from geminate roots, or roots III<sup>2</sup> (there are no examples from hollow roots) as *wehēbētî rā<sup>c</sup>ê gōyim* ("I will bring the wicked of the nations", Ezek 7:24), and other cases in (b) Hos 2:14, (c) Exod 29:9, where the second constituent is the object, and also, with an indirect object, *weqin-nētî* ("I will act with zeal for my Holy Name", Ezek 39:25). In forms from roots III *h*, stress is final only in *wehikkētî* Exod 12:12, where the verb is followed by a long object constituent, the main division of which follows its fourth word.

21.2 Stress is PENULTIMATE in forms from roots III *h* in *wehilwâtā gōyim rabbîm* ("You will lend to many nations", Deut 28:12) and eight other cases in which the second constituent is composed of two or three

---

to the conditioning of stress position. The most recent study (Artom, 1958) involves the accentuation in the attempt to do this, but the rules evolved (p. 208) do not cover even the limited area of forms from roots III *h* in two-word clauses. Penultimate *šere* is stressed with a conjunctive accent in *wenil<sup>2</sup>ētî* (Jer 20:9), *wenidkētî* (Ps 38:9), and is not stressed with a disjunctive in *wehīrbētî* (Lev 26:9).

31. To assist precise comparisons, the forms listed are categorized as from (a) hollow roots, (b) geminate roots, (c) roots III<sup>2</sup>, (d) roots III *h*.

32. As in the two *hip<sup>c</sup>il* forms in Ps 118:25, the equally surprising *mizrehā šāmeš* (Deut 4:41), and *yīšpūtū hem* (Exod 18:26). Final stress is not likely to have arisen through error or carelessness in any of these cases, but the conditioning which presumably caused it is not understood.

words,<sup>33</sup> and also in *wehikkûî* (Isa 8:17) where the second constituent is long, but its main division follows its first word.

21.3 It seems clear that final stress is usual in clauses of this sort except in forms from roots III *h*. In other forms, presumably, the clause was spoken as a unit, without a break sufficient to prevent the development of final stress. In forms of roots III *h*, the natural division between the constituents did prevent this development except under the most favourable conditions: where the verb was followed by its object, and the next significant division was distant.

22.1 In clauses of three constituents, stress is FINAL

—where the verb is followed by its object, as *wahāsibbôî pānay mēhem* Ezek 7:22, and eleven other cases.<sup>34</sup>

—where the verb is separated from its object by one word, as *wahāqē-mōîā lekā ʾābānīm gedōlôt* Deut 27:2, and seven other cases.<sup>35</sup>

22.2 Stress is PENULTIMATE

—where the verb is followed by its object in *wahāšibôî* Amos 1:8.

—where the verb is separated from its object by one word in *wehošēʾîā* Job 15:13.

—where the clause does not include an object constituent, as *wehišqûā beraglekā kegan hayyārāq* Deut 11:10, also *wahānîhōî* 2 Sam 7:11.

22.3 It is clear that the influence of the object is likely to cause the development of final stress in the verb (cf. #16.3). In the exception in Amos 1:8, the clause is third of three<sup>36</sup> clauses describing attacks on separate Philistine cities followed by a concluding clause giving the results for all three. Where the verb shows final stress in clauses of this sort, the clause is never similarly related to what precedes, so this relationship may have prevented the development of final stress.<sup>37</sup> In the exception in Job 15:13, penultimate stressing may have been caused by a division

33. Also Gen 24:8, Deut 26:10, 30:17, 1 Sam 15:30, 23:2 (the second of a pair of verbs), 2 Kgs 5:18, Joel 4:21, Ps 19:14 (at the main division of a stich). The longest second constituent is *lipenê YHWH ʾēlōhēkā* (Deut 26:10).

34. In (a) Exod 23:25, Ezek 11:19, Joel 4:7, Zech 9:7, 13:7; (b) Ezek 22:15; (d) Jer 31:14, Ezek 39:3, Amos 3:15, Nah 3:5, 5. The clauses are all short (3–5 words). The longest second constituent is *nepeš hakkōhānīm* (Jer 31:14).

35. In (a) 2 Sam 9:7, Jer 23:5; (b) Num 17:20, Ezek 20:38; (c) Isa 65:9; (d) Jer 33:6, Ezek 32:7. The third constituent ranges from one word (as in Isa 65:9) to seven (as in Num 17:20).

36. The second clause is a “dependent” clause: one in which some constituent(s) of the preceding clause (here the verb) is “understood” or “gapped”.

37. If so, then the main division must have been between the third and fourth clauses, as in the similar structure in Amos 1:5, not between the second and third, as the *atnah* of the accentuation.

after the verb like that marked by the accents in the similar structure in Job 9:30 (see #18.3).

23.1 In clauses of more than three constituents, stress is FINAL

—where the verb is followed by its object as *wešakkōî kappî ˘alékā ˘ad ˘obri* (Exod 33:22); also forms in (a) 1 Chr 22:10; (b) Isa 65:7; (c) Ezek 12:4.

—where the verb is separated from its object by one word, as *wehōšētā ˘lāhem mayim min hassela ˘* (Num 20:8); also in (a) Ezek 34:29, Mal 3:10.

—where no object is present in *ûbērētā lekā šām be˘ereš . . .* Josh 17:15.

23.2 Stress is PENULTIMATE

—where the verb is followed by its object in *wahāsîrôtā demê ˘innām āšer . . .* 1 Kgs 2:31.

—where the verb is separated from its object by a two-word phrase in (a) Amos 9:9.

23.3 Here again it appears that a verb was usually closely joined to the object if it followed directly or was separated only by one word. In the exception in 1 Kgs 2:31 the verb was probably separated from the object phrase because of its length (five words, compared to one or two in the other cases. The verb has *legarmeh*). In the case in Amos 9:9, penultimate stress seems anomalous (see #25.2).<sup>38</sup>

24.1 The cases in which verbs from roots III *h* show anomalous stress position are related as follows to the patterns described above. In Lev 24:5, *we˘āpîṭā* (see #17) stands in a three-constituent clause, followed by its object. Consequently final stress would be expected in a form from stem other than *qal* even where the word following the verb did not begin with *alep* (#22.1). In *wehirbûā* 1 Chr 4:10 (see #19.2) penultimate stress seems unlikely under #20.3 if the following word did not begin with *alep*. The clause is second in a group of four. Possibly the stress pattern reflects the treatment of this clause as closely related to the preceding but not to the following—that is, a form of tradition in which the four clauses were divided two and two, instead of three and one as in the received accentuation. It is possible, then, that these two cases do reflect the same conditioning factors as the majority of these forms.

24.2 In the four cases referred to in #19.3, the penultimate stressing would be anomalous even if the following word did not begin with a guttural. Thus the verb of a three-constituent clause shows final stress where followed by its object in twelve of thirteen cases (#22), but this is

38. The verb may have been joined in a unit with the preceding participle, “I will command to toss . . .” (cf. #18.5).

not true of *weha*<sup>c</sup>*ālītā* in Judg 6:26, Jer 38:10. The same is true of a longer clause in four of five cases (#23, see also #25.3), but not in *weṣiwwîî* (Lev 25:21).<sup>39</sup> The verb of a longer clause shows final stress where separated from its object by one word in all three cases (#23.1, see also #25.2), but not in *weha*<sup>c</sup>*ālītā* in Deut 27:6. As with the cases of *waw* "simple" with the perfect listed in #4.3, there is no doubt a good reason for the stressing of these four forms, but it is not possible to relate it to the relatively regular patterns shown by the other forms. Consequently they are not considered as providing evidence on the conditioning of stress position.

25 It appears from this survey that the feature which has the greatest influence on the development of final stress in *waw* consecutive perfect forms generally, is the position of the verb form relative to the end of the speech unit, be that the end of the clause, of a division within the clause, or the end of a unit composed of two short clauses.

25.1 The basic framework for these divisions is syntactic: the arrangement of the text in words, phrases, and clauses. Semantic factors determine whether the relation of one of these to the following is so close that its syntactic boundary fails to create a significant division. If this is the case, the boundary of the unit will not be marked by any phenomenon characteristic of the end of a speech unit. This effect of semantic relationship is strikingly seen in the fact that, under certain semantic conditions, a *waw* consecutive perfect form will show final stress before a word stressed on its first syllable, whether the penultimate syllable of the verb is closed or open (see #18.6e, cf. also the failure of unit-end markers at clause-ends noted in #9.1, #16.3.i, #20.3, and, for *nesīgā*; Revell, 1983, p. 41).

25.2 The conventional rhythm of speech tends, no doubt in part for physiological reasons, to produce speech units more or less equal in length. This rhythmic factor clearly has an effect on the formation of speech units in some cases, as in the treatment of lists, described in #10, where the items are grouped arbitrarily to produce units of similar length. This same factor appears to govern the division of longer clauses.

(a) In clauses of more than three constituents, where the verb is not followed by its object, stress is FINAL where the natural semantic division of the clause follows the third constituent, and the unit made up of the first three constituents is not inconveniently long. Thus—where the second and third constituents are each composed of only one word:

39. Some unimportant sources show final stress on the verb here. See Ginsburg (1926, *ad loc*).

Num 20:8, Josh 17:15, Ezek 34:29, Mal 3:10 (#23.1), and even where the second constituent is stressed on its first syllable: Exod 34:2 (#15.5).

—Where the second constituent is one word (stressed on its first syllable), the third is a two-word phrase, and the fourth two or three words: Exod 26:33, 28:17 (#18.6).

(b) Stress is PENULTIMATE where the second constituent is stressed on its first syllable, and the first three constituents would make an inconvenient unit, so that a pause after the second was desirable for rhythmic reasons.

—Because the third constituent was long, and the fourth, one word, so that division after the third would lead to rhythmic imbalance: Josh 15:16 = Judg 1:12 (#15.5), 1 Chr 22:9 (#18.6e), and probably Hos 2:17 (#15.5), since the third constituent <sup>2</sup>*et kerāmēhā* seems significantly longer, and the fourth, *miššām*, significantly shorter, than *mayim* and *min hassela*<sup>c</sup>, in Num 20:8, the most similar case with final stress.

—Because the third constituent begins a series of three parallel phrases forming the object, which is long enough to form an independent speech unit, and the following constituent is also long: Jer 24:10 (#15.5).

—Because the fourth constituent expands the subject pronoun in the verb, so the situation is effectively that of a short three-constituent clause closely related to what follows: 2 Sam 9:10 (#15.5, cf. #15.4d, unless this is to be regarded as an anomaly).

Penultimate stress in *wahāni*<sup>c</sup> *ôti* Amos 9:9 (#23.2), before a two-word prepositional phrase, seems an exception to these patterns (but see n. 38).

(c) In clauses of three constituents in which the verb is followed by its object, the speech unit was generally restricted to the verb and its object, as elsewhere (#16.3.ii). Consequently the development of final stress is blocked by initial stress on the following word: Deut 16:2 (#15.5), Lev 26:36, Mal 2:3 (#18.6b), exception Num 31:28 (see #18.6b). Elsewhere stress is final (four cases, #23.1) unless the object constituent is exceptionally long, making a pause after the verb desirable on rhythmic grounds: 1 Kgs 2:31 (#23.2).

25.3 The fact that the rhythmic factor appears to condition the stressing of these forms in the same way, whether the penultimate syllable is closed or open, supports the conclusion reached in #18.6, #25.1, that the basic conditioning was the same for all forms. This is the conditioning by the intonation patterns characteristic of the speech units into which the text was divided. The effect of these intonation patterns is, however, modified by the structure of the verb forms, and, in some cases, by other factors.

26.1 The factors conducive to final stressing have less effect where the penultimate syllable is open than where it is closed, and least effect of all

on forms from roots III *h*. Final stress did not develop in these latter forms in two-constituent clauses unless the second constituent (or the first division of it) was more than three words in length, except under the most favourable conditions (where the following word began with *alep* #19.2, #21). In forms from other roots final stress develops (where the following word does not begin with a guttural) if the last main stress in the unit is more than three syllables from the verb (#20.3, #21). In clauses of three constituents, the divisions between the constituents were not of sufficient significance to bring this length factor into play except where both second and third were prepositional (#22.2). Presumably in this case a significant division was made after the second constituent, which is not long enough either in Deut 11:10 (verb from root III *h*, second constituent four syllables) or 2 Sam 7:11 (verb from hollow root, second constituent two syllables) to allow the development of final stress in the verb. In the four-constituent clause in Josh 17:15 where no object is present, the main division presumably followed the third constituent (as in the accentuation) providing a unit after the verb long enough for the development of final stress, as in a three-constituent clause (see #25.2). The different structures of verb forms, then, form a hierarchy according to the extent to which they inhibit the development of final stress. In all forms, stress is penultimate if the verb is followed by a significant division (#14.1–6, 18.1–5). Elsewhere, the development of final stress is blocked in forms with a closed penultimate only where the following word is stressed on its first syllable and is followed by a significant division (#15). In forms with an open penultimate, final stress is not developed unless the next division is more distant, as described above. Whether or not a given division is “significant” enough to block the development of final stress in any particular case is determined by the syntactic, semantic and rhythmic factors as described in #25.

26.2 The factor conducive to the development of final stress—position within a “clause-level” speech unit—is the same for all forms. The effect of this factor is inhibited by “phrase-level” subdivisions of this unit in the way described. Such subdivisions have no effect on forms with a closed penultimate syllable, except where the verb is followed by a word stressed on its first syllable. Where the penultimate syllable is open, the effect of the subdivisions is greatest on forms of three syllables or less which do not have an originally long antepenultimate (see #19.1). The effect of the subdivisions is nullified in a few of these forms, and in most others, where the following word begins with a guttural (#19). It is, however, important to note that a following guttural has no effect in a position in which the development of final stress would be blocked in a form with a closed penultimate syllable, whether this be a “clause-level”

division (#18.5), or before a word stressed on its first syllable (#18.6e). That is, the development of final stress is blocked in all forms at the end of a clause-level unit. Position within such a unit is conducive to the development of final stress, but whether or not this occurs is dependent on the internal structure of the unit, the significant factors being the structure of the verb form, the nature of the following sound, and also the position of the verb relative to the last main stress in a "phrase-level" subdivision of the unit. The distinction made in Blau (1971, #5.4) between a "shift" to final stress shown in forms with a closed penultimate, and a "tendency" to such a shift in other forms, although of course based on accurate observation, is arbitrary, and obscures the larger picture.

27 Stress position in perfect forms with *waw* consecutive is, then, conditioned by the intonation patterns characteristic of the speech units into which the text was divided (in one form of the reading tradition) according to the syntactic, (other) semantic, and rhythmic factors described. Whether or not these intonation patterns induce final stress in a verb form at a given position in a unit is determined by the phonological structure of the unit. Because our information comes from a written source which does not represent these intonation patterns (see #12), it is not possible to provide a comprehensive, precise, and objective description of the boundaries of the units, let alone a description of their structure. However, the relation of stress position to the syntactic, semantic, and rhythmic factors is sufficiently clear that there can be no doubt that the variation in stress position in these forms represents one of the many facets of the influence of these intonation patterns on the vowing and stress position of the words of biblical Hebrew.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Artom, E. S. 1958. "The Accent of the Consecutive Perfect of Verbs *tertia* <sup>3</sup> and *h*." *Leshonenu* 22:205-208.
- Ben David, Y. 1984. "Pausal Forms in Verses Lacking the <sup>3</sup>*Etnaḥta*<sup>3</sup> in the Twenty-One Books." *Textus* 11:51-63.
- Bergsträsser, G. 1929. *Hebräische Grammatik*, II Teil. Leipzig.
- Blau, J. 1971. "The General Background of the Stress Shift in the Perfect with *Wāw* Consecutive" (= "Marginalia Semitica 5"). *Israel Oriental Studies* 1:15-24.
- Driver, S. R. 1892. *A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew*<sup>3</sup>. Edinburgh.

- Ginsburg, C. D. 1926. *The Old Testament . . . with the Various Readings from MSS.* London.
- Gordon, C. H. 1938. "The Accentual Shift in the Perfect with *Waw* Consecutive." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 57:319–325.
- Huesman, J. 1956. "The Infinitive Absolute and the *Waw* + Perfect Problem." *Biblica* 37:410–434.
- Loretz, O. 1961. "The *Perfectum Copulativum* in 2 Sam 7, 9–11." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 23:294–296.
- Mayer, R. 1959. "Auffallender Erzählungsstil in einem angeblichen Auszug aus der 'Chronik der Könige von Juda'." *Festschrift Friedrich Baumgärtel*, ed. J. Herrmann (Erlanger Forschungen, Reihe A, Bd 10) Erlangen, p. 114–123.
- McFall, L. 1982. "The Tone Shift in 1st and 2nd Persons Masc. Sing. *wqtl*-forms" and "The Determining Influence of the Syntactical Context on the Position of the Verbal Tone" = Appendix 2, pp. 189–210 in L. McFall, *The Enigma of the Hebrew Verbal System*. Sheffield.
- Revell, E. J. 1980. "Pausal Forms in Biblical Hebrew: their Function, Origin, and Significance." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 25:165–179.
- . 1981. "Syntactic/Semantic Structure and the Reflexes of Original Short *a* in Tiberian Pointing." *Hebrew Annual Review* 5:75–100.
- . 1983. "*Nesiga* and the History of the Masorah." *Estudios Masoréticos* pp. 37–48 (= *Textos y Estudios* 33). Madrid.
- . 1984. "Stress and the *Waw* 'Consecutive' in Biblical Hebrew." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 104:437–444.
- Yeivin, I. 1980. *Introduction to the Tiberian Masorah*. Missoula.